

Application No. 10/800,537
Amendment dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2005

Docket No.: 209593-81554

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-4 and 10-28 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended. New claims 29-38 have been added, which are fully supported by the application as filed. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 5-9 and 29-38 will be pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following Remarks.

I. Objection to the Specification

The Abstract was objected to for describing a non-elected invention. Applicant has amended the Abstract to describe an elected invention and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 5-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,734,112 to Finney et al. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As a preliminary matter claims 10-13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection with respect to these claims moot. Regarding claims 5-9, nowhere does Finney disclose a fluid connector that includes a fitting, a fluid conveying member sized for receipt in the fitting and including an opening defined by a bushing having cooperatively deformed portions of the fluid conveying member and a fitting wall that separates a first fluid duct from a second fluid duct. In contrast, Finney discloses a main (12) having an upset portion (62) that anchors the main (12) to a service fitting (10) without deforming the service fitting (10).

The claims that depend from claim 5 include additional patentably distinct limitations and, therefore, are patentably distinct as well. For example, nowhere does Finney disclose a bushing including material from the fitting and the fluid conveying member that is welded together, as recited in amended claim 8. At most, the service fitting (10) and the main (12) in Finney are mechanically interlocked. For at least these reasons, the §102(b) is unsupported by Finney and should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/800,537
Amendment dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 6, 2005

Docket No.: 209593-81554

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 06 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-3145, under Order No. 209593-81554 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 12/6/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Bradley J. Diehl

Registration No.: 47,526
HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND
COHN LLP
32270 Telegraph Road
Suite 225
Bingham Farms, Michigan 48025-2457
(248) 566-8516
Attorney for Applicant

OAKLAND986359